1 2 3 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 4 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 5 6 VIRGIL T. LEE, No. C 06-1416 JSW (PR) 7 Petitioner, 8 **ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE** VS. 9 JAMES A. YATES, Warden, 10 Respondent. (Docket No. 2) 11 12 13 INTRODUCTION 14 Petitioner, a prisoner of the State of California, currently incarcerated at Pleasant 15 Valley State Prison in Coalinga, California, has filed a habeas corpus petition pursuant to 16 28 U.S.C. § 2254 challenging the constitutional validity of his state conviction. Petitioner 17 has also filed a motion to proceed in forma pauperis, which is now GRANTED (docket 18 no. 2). This order directs Respondent to show cause why the petition should not be 19 granted. 20 **BACKGROUND** 21 According to the petition, Petitioner was convicted after trial in Santa Clara 22 County Superior Court and sentenced to a term of eight years in state prison. Petitioner 23 appealed his conviction to the California Court of Appeal in 2004. The Supreme Court of 24 California denied Petitioner's petition for review in 2005. Petitioner filed the instant 25 federal habeas petition on February 24, 2006. 26 **DISCUSSION** 27 I Standard of Review 28

This court may entertain a petition for a writ of habeas corpus "in behalf of a

6

7 8

9 10

12

11

13 14

15 16

17 18

19 20

21

22

23

24 25

26

27 28 person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court only on the ground that he is in custody in violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United States." 28 U.S.C. § 2254(a).

It shall "award the writ or issue an order directing the respondent to show cause why the writ should not be granted, unless it appears from the application that the applicant or person detained is not entitled thereto." *Id.* § 2243.

## II Legal Claims

The petition raises the following ground for relief: Petitioner's Sixth Amendment rights were violated by the trial court's failure to provide a short continuance for counsel to consult with an expert prior to cross-examination of the prosecution's expert witness. Liberally construed, it does not appear from the face of the petition that Petitioner is not entitled to relief. Accordingly, Respondent is ordered to respond to the petition as set forth below.

## **CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons and for good cause shown,

- 1. The Clerk shall serve by certified mail a copy of this order and the petition, and all attachments thereto, on Respondent and Respondent's attorney, the Attorney General of the State of California. The Clerk also shall serve a copy of this order on Petitioner.
- 2. Respondent shall file with the Court and serve on Petitioner, within **sixty** (60) days of the issuance of this order, an answer conforming in all respects to Rule 5 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases, showing cause why a writ of habeas corpus should not be granted. Respondent shall file with the answer and serve on Petitioner a copy of all portions of the state trial record that have been transcribed previously and that are relevant to a determination of the issues presented by the petition. If Petitioner wishes to respond to the answer, he shall do so by filing a traverse with the Court and serving it on Respondent within **thirty** (30) days of his receipt of the answer.
  - 3. Respondent may file a motion to dismiss on procedural grounds in lieu of an

1	answer, as set forth in the Advisory Committee Notes to Rule 4 of the Rules Governing
2	Section 2254 Cases. If Respondent files such a motion, Petitioner shall file with the Court
3	and serve on Respondent an opposition or statement of non-opposition within thirty (30)
4	days of receipt of the motion, and Respondent shall file with the Court and serve on
5	Petitioner a reply within <b>fifteen</b> (15) days of receipt of any opposition.
6	4. It is Petitioner's responsibility to prosecute this case. Petitioner must keep
7	the Court informed of any change of address by filing a separate paper captioned "Notice
8	of Change of Address." He must comply with the Court's orders in a timely fashion.
9	Failure to do so may result in the dismissal of this action for failure to prosecute pursuant
10	to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b)
11	IT IS SO ORDERED.
12	DATED: July 14, 2006
13	DATED: July 14, 2006
14	JEFFREY S. WHITE United States District Judge
15	Office States District stage
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	2